

REMARKS

With the addition of claim 19, claims 1-5, 8-11, and 13-19 are now pending in the above-referenced application and are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

The Examiner objected to the claims because the acronym TRAM has not been written out. Such an amendment is unnecessary because one of ordinary skill in the art, when reading the claims correctly in light of the specification, which explains what "TRAM" stands for at page 16, would understand the meaning of "TRAM."

Claims 1-5, 8-11, and 13-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,327,602 to Kim ("Kim"). Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 to recite a demultiplexer that is connected upstream from the buffer block. According to this amendment, the demultiplexer transmits only to the at least one first buffer the data values to which the first mathematical operation to be performed thereto after being transferred to the computation block is the addition operation by the computation block, and transmits only to the at least one second buffer the data values to which the first mathematical operation to be performed thereto after being transferred to the computation block is the multiplication operation. Support for this amendment is found at least in Figure 7 and its accompanying description in the specification.

Kim does not teach such a demultiplexer because the demultiplexer 505 of Kim does not transmit only to the at least one first buffer the data values to which the first mathematical operation to be performed thereto after being transferred to the computation block is the addition operation by the computation block, nor does it transmit only to the at least one second buffer the data values to which the first mathematical operation to be performed thereto after being transferred to the computation block is the multiplication operation by the computation block. Instead, demultiplexer 505 of Kim transmits data to IDCT output buffer 506 and other data to multiplexer 501. In no way can this operation of demultiplexer 505 be characterized as meeting the operation of the demultiplexer recited in the claims.

As for claim 14, Kim fails to teach the step of determining whether the data value corresponds to one of an addition operation and a multiplication operation, wherein the determining is performed upstream of a computation block. In Kim, data output from the multiplexer 501 located upstream of all the registers 601-619 is transmitted onto a single line. If all the data is put onto a single line upstream of the computation elements Kim, then no need exists to perform the determining step of

claim 14 upstream of all the computation elements of Kim. Similarly, demultiplexer 505 does not perform this step because it instead determines whether the input data is to be transmitted to an IDCT output buffer 506 or multiplexer 501. Therefore, Kim does not anticipate claim 14.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection based is the multiplication operation. and that transmits The Examiner asserts that by the computation block,

Claims 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jang. The Examiner argues that Jang teaches the determining step of claim 14 by stating “property of IDCT as cited in col. 1-2 under background of the invention[sic].” Office Action of 5/19/05 at page 5. Nevertheless, even if such a determination is a property of performing an IDCT operation, it does not follow that the determining is made upstream of a computation block, as recited in amended claim 14, the amendment of which is supported at least by Figure 7. Indeed, in Jang, no such determination is made in the transpose memory 120, which is upstream of processors 130 and 140; to the contrary, it appears that such a determination, if it is made at all, is made at the computation elements of Jang, namely processors 130 and 140. Therefore, since Jang does not perform the determining step upstream of the computational element, Jang does not anticipate claims 14 or 15.

New claim 19 is the system analog to method claim 14; therefore, Applicants submit that this claim is patentable for at least the same reasons given in support of the patentability of claim 14.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious, and useful. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON

Dated: 10/19/05

By: L. Magistre
Dervis Magistre
Reg. No. 41,172

One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200